



COPY OF PAPERS  
ORIGINALLY FILED

Patent Application  
Attorney Docket No. PC8605F

#7  
m.m.  
4/24/02

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on this 27th day of March, 2002.

By

*Kristina L. Konstas*

(Signature of person mailing)

Kristina L. Konstas

(Typed or printed name of person)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF: YUHPYNG L. CHEN :

Examiner: Jones, D.

APPLICATION NO.: 09/583,372 :

Group Art Unit: 1614

FILING DATE: May 31, 2000 :

TITLE: CORTICOTROPIN RELEASING  
FACTOR ANTAGONISTS :

RECEIVED

APR 15 2002

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Communication in Response to September 27, 2001 Office Action

Sir:

This Communication is submitted in response to the Office Action issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on September 27, 2001 in connection with the above-identified patent application. A response to the September 27, 2001 Office Action was originally due one month from the mailing date thereof, i.e. by October 27, 2001. Applicant is filing herewith a Petition requesting a five month extension of time for responding to the September 27, 2001 Office Action, whereby the due date for responding to said Office Action will be extended to March 27, 2002. The fee for the five month extension of time is authorized in said Petition. Accordingly, this Communication is being filed.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the subject application.

In the September 27, 2001 Office Action the Examiner stated that the claims of the subject application should be restricted to one of the following Groups: I. Claims 1-4, directed to compounds; II. Claims 5-8, directed to a process of making.

According to the Examiner, Groups I and II are related as process of making and product made. The Examiner asserted that the product as claimed in the claims of Group I can be made by a process materially different from that claimed in the claims of Group II. In this regard, the Examiner stated that the materially different process is by varying the instantly claimed steps and in using different reagents and reaction parameters.